



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,300	09/18/2000	Stephane Herman Maes	YO999-380	3906
7590	06/28/2004		EXAMINER	
William E Lewis Ryan Mason & Lewis LLP 90 Forest Avenue Locust Valley, NY 11560			WINDER, PATRICE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	7
DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	✓
	09/664,300	MAES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrice Winder	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-27,29,33-49 and 51-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12,28,30-32 and 50 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention in the reply filed on April 21, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the "different embodiments are searchable in the same effort". This is not found persuasive because applicant admits that there are multiple embodiments of the present invention. Applicant further admits that there is an embodiment for each different type of content. Essential to the scope of the search effort is the present classification of applicant's invention, it is worth noting that each embodiment is classified distinctly. Therefore, the embodiments are not searchable by the same effort as argued.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 13-27, 29, 33-49, 51-53 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected with traverse, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on April 21, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 30-32 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mauldin et al., USPN 5,664,227 (hereafter referred to Mauldin).

5. Regarding claim 30, taught a method of processing an information signal containing content presented in accordance with at least two modalities, the method comprising the steps of:

obtaining the information signal (column 4, lines 35-38);

separating the information signal into a first signal including information in one of the two modalities and a second signal including information in the other of the two modalities (column 4, lines 35-38);

performing content detection on the first signal to detect whether the first signal includes particular content presented in accordance with the one modality (column 5, lines 17-22);

performing content detection on the second signal to detect whether the second signal includes particular content presented in accordance with the other modality (column 7, lines 24-36);

combining the results associated with the content detection steps (column 8, lines 32-34); and

generating a control signal, when the particular content is detected in accordance with at least one of the content detection steps, for use in controlling at least one of a rendering property of the particular content and implementation of a specific action relating to the particular content (column 8, lines 32-34, 49-58).

6. Regarding dependent claim 31, Mauldin taught the two modalities are audio and video (column 4, lines 35-38).

7. Regarding dependent claim 32, Mauldin taught the content detection step performed on the video signal is optical character recognition (column 5, lines 26-30) and the content detection step performed on the audio signal is speech recognition (column 7, lines 58-65).

8. The language of claim 50 is substantially the same as previously rejected claims 30-32. Therefore, Claim 50 is rejected on the same rationale as previously rejected claims 30-32.

9. Claims 1-12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hejna, Jr. , USPN 6,374,225 B1 (hereafter referred to as Hejna).

10. Regarding claim 1, Hejna taught a method of processing an information signal containing content presented in accordance with at least one modality (abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

obtaining the information signal (column 16, lines 14-17);

performing content detection on the information signal to detect whether the information signal includes particular content presented in accordance with the at least one modality (column 16, lines 22-45);

generating a control signal, when the particular content is detected, for use in controlling at least one of a rendering property of the particular content and implementation of a specific action relating to the particular content (column 17, lines 16-31).

11. Regarding dependent claim 2, Hejna taught the at least one modality in which the content in the information signal is presented is audio-based (column 16, lines 21-25).

12. Regarding dependent claim 3, Hejna taught the at least one modality in which the content in the information signal is presented is video-based (column 16, lines 21-25).

13. Regarding dependent claim 4, Hejna taught the at least one modality in which the content in the information signal is presented is audio-based and video-based (column 16, lines 21-25).

14. Regarding dependent claim 5, Hejna taught the controlled rendering property is a presentation speed of the particular content (column 17, lines 37-42).

15. Regarding dependent claim 6, Hejna taught the presentation speed is controlled in accordance with detection of specific content classes in the information signal (column 17, lines 5-15).
16. Regarding dependent claim 7, Hejna taught a specific content class comprises one of numbers, names and addresses (column 18, lines 18-25).
17. Regarding dependent claim 8, Hejna taught the presentation speed of the particular content is at least one of slowed down and sped up (column 15, lines 45-55).
18. Regarding dependent claim 9, Hejna taught the presentation speed of the particular content is slowed down from an initial sped-up presentation speed (column 15, lines 45-55).
19. Regarding dependent claim 10, Hejna taught further comprising the step of providing a user interface to control at least one of the rendering property of the particular content and the implementation of the specific action relating to the particular content (column 5, lines 17-34).
20. Regarding dependent claim 11, Hejna taught further comprising the step of marking at least a portion of the information signal in response to a user input such that the content detection step is performed on the marked portion of the information to detect whether the marked portion of the information signal includes particular content (column 13, lines 5-15).
21. Regarding dependent claim 12, Hejna taught further comprising the step of storing the particular content when detected in the information signal (data structure, column 18, lines 10-23).

22. The language of claim 28 is substantially the same as previously rejected claims 11 and 12. Therefore, claim 28 is rejected on the same rationale as claims 11 and 12.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. Jain et al., USPN 6,144,375: taught a method and apparatus for interactively viewing multimedia information, the user selects events using a viewer, the viewer then synchronizes all of the multimedia types associated with the selected event for playback.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is 703-305-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 am-7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-3662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Patrice Winder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2155

plw